



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

March 14, 1977

Present: Zielinski, Pugmire, Cutter, Hannaford, Kulmala

Minutes of the February 28 meeting were accepted as read.

Frank Hannaford reported that the requested legend had been added to the plan of Fenn School land on Berry Corner Lane. The word "applicant" had been changed to "owner," but it otherwise conformed to the Planning Board request.

The planned presentation by Jim McNally was reportedly delayed because of surveying difficulties and the Board was asked to place it on the agenda for the March 28 meeting.

Kay Kulmala suggested that a 800 scale map showing assessors lines would be valuable in seeing what large parcels in town are or might become available for development.

George Nickerson presented for Nicherson-Foster, Inc., a plan of land in Hemlock Hill Estates showing a parcel called Lot 1 containing 87,129 sq. ft. (being 9 sq. ft. more than 2 acres) bounded by Milne Cove Road and Laurelwood Drive. The Board requested that the legend "Planning Board approval under Subdivision Control Law not required" be added to the linen with space for the date and four signatures. They also requested that Laurelwood Drive be indicated as a proposed way since construction of the road has not yet begun.

A schedule was distributed showing the steps that must be taken by the Board and by the Selectmen before the April 21 hearing on Bylaw changes.

The first draft from John Brown Associates showing technical and clarification changes in the Zoning Bylaw to conform with Chapter 808 was studied. Further changes and rewording were recommended which will be discussed with Brown. As a result, this draft will not be ready to submit to the Selectmen at their March 16 meeting as originally planned, but this will not affect the time schedule.

The recent plan of BayBank-Harvard Trust was reviewed with the following comments:

1. The plan does not show water and access easements that go with this plot plan.
2. The Business Zone is not labeled on the plan.
3. Abutters names are not shown.
4. While the Board heartily endorses the abandonment of front parking on this site, new parking directly behind the building is in violation of the setback requirement and parking is being extended into the Residential District beyond the 30-foot limitation permitted by the Bylaw.
5. The Planning Board would prefer to see the entrance on the western side of the building be used for ingress and the access easement through the neighboring residence property be used for traffic egress. (Article 6, Section 2.B.1.j. of the Zoning Bylaw may have bearing on this area.)
6. No provision is made on the plan to indicate required screening between the business use and adjoining residential property.

These comments will be sent by letter to the Selectmen.

Meeting adjourned 12:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith DeLong
Meredith DeLong, Secretary